

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/465,690 | 12/17/1999 | PAUL H. LEAMON | 4889:62 | 9186 |
| 75 | 90 06/30/2003 | | | |
| ATTEN: GREGORY W. CARR CARR & STORM, LLP 670 FOUNDERS SQUARE | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BOYCE, ANDRE D | |
| 900 JACKSON STREET | | | | |
| DALLAS, TX 75202 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3623 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 11 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| Interview Summary | 09/465,690 | LEAMON ET AL. | | | | |
| merview commany | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Andre Boyce | 3623 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): | | | | | | |
| (1) <u>Andre Boyce</u> . | (3) <u>Ahram Suh</u> . | | | | | |
| (2) <u>Tariq Hafiz</u> . | (4) <u>Paul Leamon</u> . | | | | | |
| Date of Interview: 25 June 2003. | | | | | | |
| Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference | | | | | | |
| c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] | | | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No. If Yes, brief description: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: 1-18. | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Crockett et al. (USPN 6044355) and Gabriner et al. (USPN 5848403). | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f)□ was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N/A. | | | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) | | | | | | |
| THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| · | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature if required

Application No. 09/465,690

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the rejections to claims 1-9 under 35 USC 101. After reviewing the proposed amendment, Examiner Boyce and Mr. Hafiz suggested additional language including "... automatically assigning..." and "... by one or more electronic processing devices.", in order to overcome the rejection. The rejection to claims 1, 7-10, and 16-18 under 35 USC 103 was also discussed. With respect to claim 1, Applicant discussed Crockett et al's alleged failure to teach or suggest "... for each factor, determining a difference value between a plurality of schedules and each agent's preference for that factor...". With further respect to claim 1, Applicant also discussed Gabriner et al's alleged failure to teach or suggest the forth, fifth, and sixth elements of the claim, including a discussion of the soft versus hard constraints disclosed by Gariner et al. Examiner Boyce and Mr. Hafiz indicated that a thourough review of Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 103, and an updated seach would need to be completed upon reciept of Applicant's official amendment, and that no judgement of persuasiveness of the arguments could be made at this point.